



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,014	08/10/2006	Gianfranco Cattapan	C&P-169US	4207
23122	7590	01/21/2009		
RATNERPRESTIA			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 980			LAWRENCE JR, FRANK M	
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1797		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/21/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/589,014

Applicant(s)

CATTAPAN, GIANFRANCO

Examiner

Frank M. Lawrence

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE-US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/10/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 5, 16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claims 5 and 16 each recite the limitation "the partial humidification unit" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

4. Claim 23 recites the limitation "the second distribution unit" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10, 12-14, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gillette et al. (2001/0003874 A1).
7. Gillette et al. '874 teach a system for drying granulated thermoplastic materials, comprising a dual-tower desiccant bed unit (100) for dehumidifying drying air, a hopper (30) for contacting dried air with the granulated materials and conducting it back to the desiccant, dew point or humidity sensors (10, 60) for detecting the dryness of air upstream and downstream of

the desiccant, valves (116, 118) upstream and downstream of the desiccant towers for controlling drying and regeneration cycles, and a diverter valve (134) with a controller (106) that can modulate an amount of wet bypass air to combine with dried air downstream of the desiccant beds (see figures, 3, 19-24, 26, 32-33, 49). Regeneration of the beds can also be controlled based on the sensed humidity (paragraphs 36-37) and the dried air can be controlled to have a predetermined dew point range of -17.8 to -40° C.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4, 5, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gillette et al. '874 in view of the Japanese reference (JP 02-247486 A).

10. Gillette et al. '874 disclose all of the limitations of the claims except that there is a partial humidification device downstream of the desiccant beds and that a preferred dew point is achieved. JP '486 discloses a hot air drying device including a moisture applicator (7) for conditioning drying air applied to an article (see abstract, figure). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the recirculation line of Gillette et al. '874 by using a moisture applicator in order to provide a means for preventing over-drying of the granulated material. One skilled in the art would also have known to provide a desired dried air dew point based on the type of material being dehumidified.

11. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gillette et al. '874 in view of Noguchi (4,601,114).
12. Gillette et al. '874 disclose all of the limitations of the claim except that the thermoplastic is prepared from PET. Noguchi '114 discloses a system for demisting air for drying synthetic material such as PET using desiccant beds (see abstract, col. 1, lines 32-51). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the system of Gillette et al. '874 for drying PET in order to provide both heated and dried air for treating the plastic.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The additional references listed on the attached PTO-892 form disclose granular plastic drying devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank M. Lawrence whose telephone number is 571-272-1161. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on 571-272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Frank M. Lawrence/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

fl